



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,558	12/03/2001	Rodney Kern	29020/97035B	3273
34431	7590	09/15/2006	EXAMINER	
HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC 20 N. WACKER DRIVE SUITE 4220 CHICAGO, IL 60606			REDMAN, JERRY E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3634	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/006,558	KERN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Jerry Redman	3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 16, 17, 20, 29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8, 16, and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 17, 20, 29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

The status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 8, 16, and 19 are withdrawn from consideration;

Claims 10-15, 18 and 21-28 have been cancelled; and

Claims 1-7, 9, 17, 20, 29, and 30 are herein addressed below.

The applicant's amendment is incorrect because the claim identifiers are wrong, i.e., withdrawn claims; but, the Examiner is waiving this rule for this amendment.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the applicant's continuation data should be updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 17, 20, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (2,878,532) in view of Leuchten et al. (4,803,108). Clark ('532) discloses two panels (C and D), an actuating system (chains, pulleys, motor, inclined guide track), which moves the panels (C and D) between an open and closed sealed position. Clark fails to disclose the panels to be formed of resilient foam having a covering. Leuchten et al. ('108) disclose an impact-absorbing panel formed of foam and

having a flexible outer covering. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the panels of Clark ('532) to be impact absorbing as taught by Leuchten et al. ('108) since this allows the panels to be resilient upon an impact without damaging the panel itself.

The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. It appears that the applicant's arguments are more limiting than that of the claims. All doors when impacted would move out of co-planar alignment. All material have some degree of flexibility and therefore all doors when impact would move out of alignment and back to its original form. The applicant fails to specify an exact number or range of force applied to the door and therefore would be inherent that all doors would operate as recited in the applicant's claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 703-308-2120.



Jerry Redman  
Primary Examiner